

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/551,414	Applicant(s) KAWAGOE ET AL.
	Examiner REBECCA ANDERSON	Art Unit 1626

All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>pending</u>
(1) <u>REBECCA ANDERSON.</u>	(3) _____.
(2) <u>Jennifer M. Hayes.</u>	(4) _____.
Date of Interview: <u>26 July 2011</u>	Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.
 Rejection(s) discussed:
n/a

Claims discussed:
1 and 28

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.
 SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The examiner left a message for Jennifer M. Hayes on 26 July 2011 to attempt to allow the instant application with an examiner's amendment to claims 1 and 28 in the definition of R2 to correct an apparent typographical error which renders the claims indefinite. Ms. Hayes attempted to contact the examiner twice on 26 July 2011 and also left messages trying to resolve the issue. As the examiner and Ms. Hayes were unable to discuss the issue and Ms. Hayes is unavailable until August 3, the examiner had to write a non-final rejection.

Part III.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Rebecca L. Anderson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)
--	---